

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/629,095	07/29/2003	Wolfgang Ramin	TID-32348 6377			
23494 75	23494 7590 04/05/2005			EXAMINER		
	RUMENTS INCORPOR	GEBREMARIAM, SAMUEL A				
P O BOX 6554 DALLAS, TX		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
			2811			
		DATE MAILED: 04/05/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summers		Application	n No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/629,09	5	RAMIN, WOLFGANG				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit				
			Gebremariam	2811				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	on appears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicate period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor reto reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by the property of the period for reply will, by the period of the period for reply will, by the period of the period for reply will, by the period of the period for reply will, by the period for reply will be	FION. CFR 1.136(a). In no ever tition. ys, a reply within the statut y period will apply and will by statute, cause the applic	nt, however, may a reply be time tory minimum of thirty (30) day expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timel the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status		•						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n <u>29 December 20</u>	<u>04</u> .					
2a)⊠	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)	☐ This action is no	on-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims			•				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the appli 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction	rithdrawn from con			·			
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Ex	kaminer.						
10)	) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to by							
Priority :	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for the All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents of the priority documents. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International See the attached detailed Office action for	cuments have beer cuments have beer ne priority docume Bureau (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Applicati nts have been receive e 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	l Stage			
Attachmei								
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-	049)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D					
3) Info	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTC er No(s)/Mail Date		5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:		O-152)			

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hamzehdoost et al., US patent No. 5,371,321.

Regarding claim 1, Hamzehdoost teaches (fig. 2) an encapsulated chip assembly comprising (refer to fig. 2): a baseplate (52), a chip (56) attached to the baseplate in such a way that its contact surfaces (the top surface of 56) face away from the baseplate (52), a layer (76) of a conductive material applied to the baseplate (52) and arranged around the chip (56) and having a support surface facing away from the baseplate (52) (the top layer of 76 supports the structures above it, therefore layer 76 has a support surface facing away from the base plate), which is at least as high as the surface of chip (56), a cover plate (68) arranged on the layer of conductive material (76), whose one side, opposing the chip (56), being provided with one or more conductive surfaces (70,72), which are arranged in such a way that they form an electrical connection between the chip (56, col. 5, lines 7-25) and the layer of conductive material (76), the support surface of the layer (76) serving as a support for the cover plate (68).

Regarding claim 6, Hamzehdoost teaches the entire claimed structure of claim 1, above including both the baseplate (52, col. 4, lines43-50) and the cover plate (68, col. 4, lines 63-67) each consist of a flexible material.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamzehdoost in view of Nakaoka et al. US patent No. 6,583,512.

Regarding claim 2, Hamzehdoost teaches substantially the entire claimed structure of claim 1 above except explicitly stating that the chip is surrounded by a filler material that fills the open space between the baseplate and the cover plate.

Nakaoka teaches the use of a filler material (30, col. 11, lines 64-67) in order to fill the space between the semiconductor devices (fig. 8c).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the filler material taught by Nakaoka in the structure of Hamzehdoost in order to further seal the device.

Regarding claim 3, Hamzehdoost teaches substantially the entire claimed structure of claims 1 and 2 above including further comprising an electrically conductive glue (74), which is to establish both the electrical and the mechanical connections between the contact surfaces of the chip (56) and of the cover plate (68).

Art Unit: 2811

Regarding claim 4, Hamzehdoost teaches substantially the entire claimed structure of claims 1 and 2 above including further comprising an anisotropically conductive film (30, col. 11, lines 64-67, Nakaoka) (ACF), which serves to establish both an electrical and a mechanical connection between the contact surfaces of the chip and the conductive surface.

Regarding claim 5, Hamzehdoost teaches substantially the entire claimed structure of claims 1 and 2 above including the filler material consists of the anisotropically conductive film (col. 11, lines 64-67, Nakaoka).

5. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamzehdoost.

Regarding claims 7-8, Hamzehdoost teaches substantially the entire claimed structure of claim 1 above except explicitly stating that the height of the chip is so low that it is rendered flexible or has a thickness of less than 50 micrometer. Since most integrated circuits use silicon Hamzehdoost teaches a chip that consists mainly of silicon.

Furthermore parameters such as height in the art of semiconductor manufacturing process are subject to routine experimentation and optimization to achieve the desired device characteristics during fabrication.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust the height of the IC of Hamzehdoost as claimed in order to form a device that is easily packaged.

6. Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamzehdoost, in view of Loeffler et al. US patent No. 5,838,074.

Regarding claim 9, Hamzehdoost teaches substantially the entire claimed structure of claims 1 and 2 above except explicitly stating that the chip comprises a transponder.

Loeffler teaches that a transponder can be integrated as an IC device (transponder IC, col. 3, lines 16-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the transponder device taught by Loeffler in the structure of Hamzehdoost in order to package a transponder device that is integrated with an integrated circuit.

Regarding claim 10, Hamzehdoost teaches substantially the entire claimed structure of claims 1 and 2 above including the conductive layer comprises an aerial.

The combined structure Hamzehdoost and Loeffler teaches a transponder that is integrated as an IC device. Since a transponder in general is equipped with an antenna structure, the combined structure of Hamzehdoost and Loeffler would inherently have an aerial that is made of a conductive material.

Regarding claim 11, Hamzehdoost teaches substantially the entire claimed structure of claims 1, and 9-10 above except explicitly stating that a chip having a transponder attached to the baseplate.

Since the combined structure of Hamzehdoost and Loeffler teaches that a transponder can be integrated as an IC device, it would have been obvious to one of Art Unit: 2811

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the transponder device taught by Loeffler in the structure of Hamzehdoost in order to package a transponder device that is integrated with an integrated circuit.

7. Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamzehdoost, Nakaoka and in view of Loeffler.

Hamzehdoost teaches substantially the entire claimed structure of claims 1, 3, 7-8 and 9-10 above including the height of the chip is so low that it is rendered flexible.

## Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 12/29/04 have been fully considered but moot in view the new grounds of rejection.

#### Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Application/Control Number: 10/629,095

Art Unit: 2811

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Page 7

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel A. Gebremariam whose telephone number is (571) 272-1653. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Lee can be reached on (571) 272-1732. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SAG March 22, 2005

EDDIE LEF

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800